

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1-12 and presented claim 15 to clarify the present invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Applicants submit herewith one sheet of corrected drawings including Fig. 1, to which the electric power network described in the specification has been illustrated. Applicants respectfully request approval of the corrected drawing and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Applicants have amended the specification to provide a description of Fig. 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure.

Applicants have amended claim 11 to depend from claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 11.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, and 6 to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. patent 5,867,356 to Duggal et al. in view of European patent 0 474 186 to Morita et al. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Morita et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 4,336,490 to Lewis. The Examiner rejects claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of U.S. patent 5,689,395 to Duffy et al. The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Morita et al. The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duggal et al. in view of Morita et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,577,108 to Hubert et al.

The combination of Duggal et al. and Morita et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a voltage raising element connected in series with an apparatus where the voltage raising element includes a first branch including a power switch and a second branch including a current resisting element connected in parallel with the power switch such that the voltage raising element further comprising a processor for signal processing of a sensed fault condition comprising reduced voltage on the network and for opening the power switch such that on sensing a fault condition at least part of the current is diverted through the voltage raising element, thereby raising the voltage between the apparatus and the grid point and maintaining the apparatus connected to the grid point for evaluation of further actions while the power network is still in operational condition. Rather, Duggal et al. suggests a configuration that includes a main switch 16 and a switch 20. Duggal et al. suggests manipulating the current flowing through the switches by variously opening and closing both switches. The present invention does not require such multiple switches. Additionally, Duggal et al. only relates to high current events or conditions.

Duggal et al. does not suggest a system that can address low voltage conditions and protect power generation equipment by raising the voltage between an apparatus and a grid point of a transmission net in an electric power system. By raising the voltage, the present invention can contribute to upholding power transfer in a network. By possibly preventing taking of drastic actions that can interrupt power distribution, the present invention can help to prevent associated disruptions. The present invention can provide time to take other actions that can restore a fault condition. On the other hand, Duggal et al. relates to current limiting circuit breakers.

Morita et al. also relates to a system that includes circuit breakers. This is contrary to the present invention, which provides a system for maintaining power distribution. Therefore, the combination of Duggal et al. and Morita et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1-3. It follows from the above that the combination of Duggal et al. and Morita et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claims 10-12 and the combination of Duggal et al., Morita et al. and Hubert et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claims 13 and 14.

Combining Duggal et al. and Morita et al. with Lewis does not suggest the present invention as recited in claim 4 since, among other things, Lewis does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Duggal et al. and Morita et al. For example, Lewis does not suggest a voltage raising element connected in series with an apparatus where the voltage raising element includes a first branch including a power switch and a second branch including a current resisting element connected in parallel with the power switch such that the voltage raising element further comprising a processor for signal processing of a sensed fault condition

comprising reduced voltage on the network and for opening the power switch such that on sensing a fault condition at least part of the current is diverted through the voltage raising element, thereby raising the voltage between the apparatus and the grid point and maintaining the apparatus connected to the grid point for evaluation of further actions while the power network is still in operational condition. The Examiner only cites Lewis as suggesting an autotransformer. An autotransformer does not suggest the aspects of the present invention recited in claim 1, from which claim 4 depends and not suggested by the combination of Duggal et al. and Morita et al.

The combination of Duggal et al. and Duffy et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claims 6-9 since, among other things, Duggal et al. does not suggest the present invention as discussed above. Duffy et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Duggal et al. Duffy et al. suggests a system for protecting a circuit from overcurrents from a power supply. Duffy et al. does not suggest a system to protect a power generator, such as a windmill, from under voltages on a system. Accordingly, the combination of Duggal et al. and Duffy et al. does not suggest the present invention as recited in claims 6-9.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not suggest patentable features of the present invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the present invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and

early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

5/16/08

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Franklin", written over a horizontal line.

Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134

Attorney for Applicants

Venable LLP

575 Seventh Street, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Telephone: 202-344-4936

Facsimile: 202-344-8300